REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated December 28, 2006 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1-15 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 based on 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0133630 by Coles et al. (hereinafter "*Coles*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, but in the interests of advancing prosecution have amended independent Claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 14, and 15 to clarify particular aspects of the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that *Coles* fails to expressly or inherently teach all of the limitations of Claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 14, and 15 as originally filed, and particularly as amended.

Coles is directed to two or more applications or devices that share a single session via a proxy. For example, "a user may be using the Web with a first and a second device, each running a single data-receiving application, but linked in a single session." (*Coles*, 0038). The devices/applications are linked by a proxy server, which "receives requests from one or more of the requesting data-receiving devices, consolidates these (if there are more than one) and forwards the consolidated request to the server." (*Coles*, 0056). The differing devices may have differing profiles, so *Coles* describes communicating multiple device profiles in HTTP headers. (*Coles*, 0114-0131). However, these multiple profile headers are not intended to indicate that a client is requesting a multipart response *for a client*.

Coles does not expressly or inherently show that clients are requesting multipart content. As *Coles* explains, a multipart response may be used by the proxy to "transport multiple response variants." (*Coles*, 0133). The "data-processing means 300 would use the ForClient: headers to demultiplex the entity parts within the response 900 from the resource server 808 and include the appropriate part in single-part (initial 902 and copycat 904) responses to individual data-receiving applications." (*Coles*, 0134). Therefore, the response 900 is not a multipart response requested by a data-receiving application, but is made of copies of the same single-part response, each tailored to the profile of a *different application*. Each data-receiving application receives a single part response in response to each application's individual request. Therefore *Coles* fails to

6

anticipate 1, 6, 11, 13, 14, and 15 at least because *Coles* fails to expressly or inherently show a client making an indication that a multipart response is desired by the client.

Regarding Claims 1, 6, 14, and 15, *Coles* further fails to expressly or inherently show sending a multipart response to a client after a second content request is received from the client, the multipart response being related to a single part response previously sent to the client. As *Coles* clearly states, the proxy "demultiplex[es] the entity parts within the response 900 from the resource server 808 and include the appropriate part in single-part (initial 902 and copycat 904) responses to individual data-receiving applications." Thus *Coles* is describing a multiple part response being received at the proxy, and the proxy using this to form multiple single part responses to the data-receiving applications. Nowhere does *Coles* describe this multiple part response being related to a previous single part response that was received either by the proxy or the data-receiving applications. Nor does *Coles* describe the data-receiving applications even seeing a multiple-part response, because the proxy demultiplexes the response and the parts are each sent to each data-receiving application as respective single part responses. For these additional reasons, *Coles* fails to anticipate Claims 1, 6, 14, and 15.

Regarding Claims 12 and 13, *Coles* fails to expressly or inherently describe precluding transmission of parallel content requests when the multipart capability indication exists within the content response. The Office Action relies on paragraph 0068 of *Coles* to show this feature, where *Coles* states "copycat requests are stalled at the caching proxy." However, these "copycat requests" are not related to multipart capabilities indicated within a response, nor are the requests used by the client applications of *Coles* to preclude generation of parallel content requests from the client applications. The copycat requests are sent in when a "data-receiving application 800 initiating the navigation operation issues an http request 802 to a target resource 808 and also stimulates all other data-receiving applications to issue copycat requests." (*Coles*, 0059). Thus, as the name implies, the copycat requests are redundant requests for the same content sent by different applications. Nowhere does *Coles* say that the applications themselves preclude parallel request for content based on copycat request. On the contrary, the applications would be unaware of the copycat requests, because the requests are received the proxy. Further, the "stalling" of the requests is performed in response to the receipt of copycat requests themselves,

7

and nowhere does *Coles* describe the proxy stalling copycat responses based on a server providing a multipart capability indicator in a content response. The stalling occurs before any responses are received at the proxy, because the proxy "waits until it has cached the response to that [initial] request before servicing the copycat requests 806." (*Coles*, 0068). For this reason, Claims 11 and 12 are further allowable over *Coles*.

Dependent Claims 2-5 depend from independent Claim 1; dependent Claims 7-10 depend from independent Claim 6; and dependent Claim 12 depends from independent Claim 11. These dependent claims also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Coles*. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, including any assertions concerning inherency or the taking of Official Notice, these rejections are now moot in view of the remarks made in connection with independent Claims 1, 6, and 11. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from *Coles*. Therefore, dependent Claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12 are also in condition for allowance.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NOKM.078PA) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: June 28, 2007   By: _____

William B. Ashley
Reg. No. 51, 419

8